	TED STATES DISTRICT CO TERN DISTRICT OF NEW		
	INTIFFS #1-20, individually similarly situated,	and on behalf, of all	
		Plaintiff,	PROPOSED VERDICT SHEET
	-against-		
POL LIEU	COUNTY OF SUFFOLK, ICE COMMISSIONER EDV JTENANT MILAGROS SO ENE,	VARD WEBBER,	15-cv-2431(WFK)(LB)
		Defendants.	
1)	Has Plaintiff # prove	ACTION – FOURTH AMEN	evidence, that defendant Scott Greene
	YES	NO	pp :
IF Y	OU ANSWERED "YES" T	TO QUESTION 1, GO TO Q	UESTION 2.
IF Y	OU ANSWERED "NO" TO	O QUESTION 1, GO TO Q	UESTION 4.
2)	-	the violation of the Fourth Ar	evidence, that defendant Edward mendment by defendant Scott Greene
	YES	NO	
3)		violation of the Fourth Amen	evidence, that defendant Milagros dment by defendant Scott Greene
	YES	NO	

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS VIOLATION

4)	Has Plaintiff # proviolated his rights to du	* * *	ourteenth Amendment?	ene
	YES	NO		
IF Y	YOU ANSWERED "YES"	" TO QUESTION 4,	GO TO QUESTION 5.	
IF Y	OU ANSWERED "NO"	TO QUESTION 4,	GO TO QUESTION 7.	
5)	-	for the violation of due	nce of the evidence, that defendant Edward e process by defendant Scott Greene based o	on a
	YES	NO		
6)	-	the violation of due pr	nce of the evidence, that defendant Milagros ocess by defendant Scott Greene based on a	
	YES	NO		
		SE OF ACTION – FO COUAL PROTECTION	OURTEENTH AMENDMENT ON VIOLATION	
7)	<u> </u>	* * *	nce of the evidence, that defendant Scott Gre he Fourteenth Amendment?	ene
	YES	NO		
IF Y	OU ANSWERED "YES"	" TO QUESTION 7,	GO TO QUESTION 8.	
IF Y	OU ANSWERED "NO"	TO QUESTION 7,	GO TO QUESTION 10.	
8)		for the equal protection	nce of the evidence, that defendant Edward n violation by defendant Scott Greene based	d
	YES	NO		
9)		the equal protection vi	nce of the evidence, that defendant Milagros colation by defendant Scott Greene based on	
	YES	NO		

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – CLAIM AGAINST SUFFOLK COUNTY

IF YOU ANSERED "YES" TO ANY OF QUESTIONS 1, 4 or 7 ANSWER QUESTION 10. IF YOU ANSWERED NO QUESTIONS 1, 4, and 7 GO TO QUESTION 12.

10)		proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant County of licy or custom to discriminate against Hispanics in traffic stops on a County
	YES	NO
IF YO	OU ANSWERED	"YES" TO QUESTION 10, GO TO QUESTION 11.
IF YO	OU ANSWERED	"NO" TO QUESTION 10, GO TO QUESTION 12.
11)	policy or custom	proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that the County of Suffolk to discriminate against Hispanics in traffic stops on a County wide basis te cause of the constitutional violations committed by Scott Greene?
	YES	NO
	]	TIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – TITLE VI CLAIM
12)		proven by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant County of nally discriminated against him based upon race, color or national origin?
	YES	NO
IF YO	OU ANSWERED	"YES" TO QUESTION 12, GO TO QUESTION 13.
OF Q QUES THE	UESTIONS 1, 4 STIONS 1, 4, and COURTROOM	"NO" TO QUESTION 12, AND YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO ANY or 7 GO TO QUESTION 14. IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" TO 7 STOP. SIGN AND DATE THE VERDICT SHEET AND INFORM DEPUTY THAT YOUR DELIBERATIONS ARE COMPLETE AND EACHED A VERDICT.
13)	evidence, that d	as a representative of the class, proven by a preponderance of the efendant County of Suffolk had a policy or custom to discriminate against fic stops on a County wide basis?
	YES	NO

## **DAMAGES**

## ONLY ANSWER THE QUESTIONS ON DAMAGES IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO ANY OF QUESTIONS 1, 4, or 7.

14)

15)

Compensatory Damages			
If you found that defendant Scott Greene engaged in conduct which caused plaintiff to suffer damages, state in dollars the amount of compensatory damages plaintiff suffered as a result of the conduct of the officer.			
\$			
If you found that defendant Edward Webber engaged in conduct which caused plaintiff to suffer damages, state in dollars the amount of compensatory damages plaintiff suffered as a result of the conduct of the officer.			
\$			
If you found that defendant Milagros Soto engaged in conduct which caused plaintiff to suffer damages, state in dollars the amount of compensatory damages plaintiff suffered as a result of the conduct of the officer.			
\$			
Punitive Damages			
Has plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant Scott Greene acted willfully, maliciously, wantonly or with reckless disregard for the plaintiff's constitutional rights?			
Yes No			
Has plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant Edward Webber acted willfully, maliciously, wantonly or with reckless disregard for the plaintiff's constitutional rights?			
Yes No			
Has plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant Milagros Soto acted willfully, maliciously, wantonly or with reckless disregard for the plaintiff's constitutional rights?			
Yes No			

IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO ANY OF QUESTION # 15, GO ON TO ANSWER QUESTION # 16. IF YOU ANSWERED NO TO QUESTION # 15, GO ON TO ANSWER QUESTION # 17.

State in dollars the amount of punitive damages, if any, Plaintiff # is entitled to recover against defendant Scott Greene.				
\$				
State in dollars the amount of punitive damages, if any, Plaintiff # is entitled to recover against defendant Edward Webber.				
\$				
State in dollars the amount of punitive damages, if any, Plaintiff # is entitled to recover against defendant Milagros Soto.				
\$				
17) <u>Nominal Damages</u>				
\$				
Please sign and date the verdict sheet and inform the courtroom deputy that your deliberations are complete and that you have reached a verdict.				
Foreperson				
Dated: Brooklyn, New York				
August , 2022				

**Amount of Punitive Damages** 

16)